



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,412	04/08/2004	Chung-Ren Wang	250908-1280	7809
24504	7590	05/19/2006	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW STE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948			SAIN, GAUTAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/820,412

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

- 1) This is a NonFinal rejection in response to application filed on 4/8/04.
- 2) Claims 1-18 are pending.
- 3) Effective filing date is the foreign priority date of 12/11/2003.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

- 4) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**4-1) Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore et al (US 6857102, filed Jan 29, 1999), in view of Earl (US 5924104, issued Jul 13, 1999).**

**Regarding claims 1 and 10,** Bickmore teaches *acquiring display capability information and preference information of a display of a mobile communication device*. For example, Bickmore discloses a document re-authoring system for providing device-independent access to the world-wide web (title), where the user can adjust various heuristics in the document reauthoring system to suit their taste, such as adjusting the relative preference of the transformations (col 27, lines 14-20), for display on a PDA (col 4, lines 46-47).

Bickmore teaches *determining the style in which the document is displayed on the mobile device based on the capability information, the preference information and the features of the document*. For example, Bickmore discloses a method where the

user can adjust various heuristics in the document reauthoring system to suit their taste, such as adjusting the relative preference of the transformations (col 27, lines 14-20), for display on a PDA (col 4, lines 46-47). Additionally, Bickmore discloses automatic document re-authoring based on characteristics of the display device so that the document can be appropriately displayed on the target display device (col 3, lines 1-5).

Bickmore does not expressly teach *a document including a plurality of questions*, but Earl does it. The Examiner interprets the claimed questions as text because displaying of a question is equivalent to displaying text on the device. Earl discloses a method for displaying intradocument links in a computer system (title) that appear as text on the display (ie., document A; see fig 2), where a document contains more than one link that links different parts of the same document (col 2, lines 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bickmore to include intradocument textual links that are selectable by the user as taught by Earl, providing the benefit of allowing users to go straight to other portions of the same document rather than scrolling through the entire document (Earl, col 2, lines 35-40). The Examiner interprets the benefit disclosed by Earl as similar to the benefit sought in the instant application, which is to overcome the technological deficiency that examiners of the survey must skip over questions while searching for the related questions fact that (see Application's Background section, lines 24-26).

**Regarding claim 2 and 11**, Bickmore does not teach a document that contains inter-question dependence information, analyzable by a program, but Earl does suggest it.

The Examiner interprets the claimed inter-question dependence information as equivalent to links from one textual location of the document to another because displaying a question is equivalent to displaying text on the device. Earl discloses a method for displaying intradocument links in a computer system (title) that appear as text on the display (ie., document A; see fig 2), where a document contains more than one link that links different parts of the same document (col 2, lines 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bickmore to include intradocument textual links that are selectable by the user as taught by Earl, providing the benefit of allowing users to go straight to other portions of the same document rather than scrolling through the entire document (Earl, col 2, lines 35-40). The Examiner interprets the benefit disclosed by Earl as similar to the benefit sought in the instant application, which is to overcome the technological deficiency that examiners of the survey must skip over questions while searching for the related questions fact that (see Application's Background section, lines 24-26).

**Regarding claim 4 and 13**, Bickmore does not teach, but Earl teaches distinguishing the alternative. Earl discloses a method for displaying intradocument links in a computer system (title) that appear as text on the display (ie., document A; see fig 2), where a document contains more than one link that links different parts of the same document (col 2, lines 40-43). Fig 2 of Earl shows a link (item 202) that points to another location in the document, namely "APPENDIX 1", which the Examiner interprets

Art Unit: 2176

as equivalent to distinguishing because the link points to another portion of the same document (see Fig 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bickmore to include intradocument textual links that are selectable by the user as taught by Earl, providing the benefit of allowing users to go straight to other portions of the same document rather than scrolling through the entire document (Earl, col 2, lines 35-40). The Examiner interprets the benefit disclosed by Earl as similar to the benefit sought in the instant application, which is to overcome the technological deficiency that examiners of the survey must skip over questions while searching for the related questions fact that (see Application's Background section, lines 24-26).

**Regarding claims 5 and 14**, Bickmore teaches displaying document using XSL.

Bickmore discloses cascading style sheets to define display attributes which is equivalent to using XSL (col 2, lines 25-30).

**Regarding claims 6 and 15**, Bickmore teaches *the preference information is acquired using techniques of composite capability/preference profile in the acquiring step*. For example, Bickmore discloses a document re-authoring system for providing device-independent access to the world-wide web (title), where the user can adjust various heuristics in the document reauthoring system to suit their taste, such as adjusting the relative preference of the transformations (col 27, lines 14-20), for display on a PDA (col 4, lines 46-47).

**Regarding claims 7 and 16**, Bickmore teaches *display capability information includes display capability information for the display including size or resolution information of the display*. For example, Bickmore discloses a method where the user can adjust various heuristics in the document reauthoring system to suit their taste, such as adjusting the relative preference of the transformations (col 27, lines 14-20), for display on a PDA (col 4, lines 46-47). Additionally, Bickmore discloses automatic document reauthoring based on characteristics of the display device so that the document can be appropriately displayed on the target display device (col 3, lines 1-5). The characteristics are interpreted as information of display capability since the characteristics are the basis of how the document will be reauthored automatically to fit the display. These characteristics include reauthoring parameters such as display screen size (col 4, line 36).

**Regarding claims 8 and 17**, Bickmore teaches preference information includes font size. Bickmore discloses adjusting the font size for headers (col 7, line 16).

**4-2) Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore et al (as cited above), in view of Earl (as cited above), further in view of Rao et al (US 20050114400, filed 11/10/2004).**

**Regarding claims 3 and 12**, Bickmore in view of Earl does not expressly teach document conforming to XML, but Rao does teach it. Rao discloses, an XML based questionnaire publishing component on a PDA (para 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bickmore in view of Earl to include a document containing XML on a

PDA as taught by Earl, providing the benefit of allowing users to create a questionnaire network for mobile handsets (Rao, Title) that facilitates display of questionnaires and collecting responses (Rao, para 10, top). The Examiner interprets the benefit disclosed by Earl as similar to the benefit sought in the instant application, which is to display a document in a mobile display device that includes survey questions (see Applicant's Summary of Invention section, page 3, lines 10-14).

**4-3) Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore et al (as cited above), in view of Earl (as cited above), further in view of Back et al (US 6515690, issued Feb 4, 2003).**

**Regarding claims 9 and 18,** Bickmore in view of Earl does not expressly teach totaling the number of questions and character numbers of a question, but Back does suggest it. The Examiner characterizes this limitation as the ability of the software to maintain a word count or character count. Back does suggest the limitation according to Examiner's characterization. Back discloses an interface for navigating dynamic text that maintains a word and/or a text count as text is displayed on the display device and counts the words displayed on the device (col 5, lines 66-6). This is equivalent to the claimed language because the Applicant's invention displays questions, which the examiner interprets as text, onto a display unit and seeks to count the number of questions. The Back reference discloses the counting of text and words of the display.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bickmore in view of Earl to include count of words and text as they



are entered on the display device as taught by Back, providing the benefit of a dynamic text presentation scheme to leverage people's knowledge (Back, col 1, lines 31 – 35).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G.S.  
5/12/06

GS

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100